DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 679 SP 024 057

AUTHOR Goodman, Jesse
TITLE Field Based Experience: A Study of Social Control and Student Teachers' Response to Institutional Constraints.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary School Teachers; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Personal Autonomy; Preservice Teacher Education; *Role Conflict; Self Determination; *Socialization; Social Values; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

An ethnographic study of 12 student teachers in an elementary school field-based program determined, through observation and interviews, how they reacted to the socializing process that is an integral factor in practicum experiences. Institutional and social forces that shaped these preservice teachers' behaviors and ideas were the elementary school curriculum and the accountability/testing movement. The majority were observed doing routine, mechanical types of teaching activities involving little creativity. There was heavy emphasis on pupil achievement and managing class activities in such a way that the children would "get through the material." At the end of the practicum, most of the student teachers felt they had learned how to manage and organize the given curriculum and classroom schedule and acquired sufficient discipline techniques. Their reactions to this socializing experience ranged from passive or active acceptance to latent or overt resistance. Study results are discussed in terms of two social science theories: (1) the reproduction theory, which focuses on the school's role in producing individuals adjusted to the institutional life of the dominant society; and (2) the resistance theory, which focuses on the way in which individuals or groups struggle against social domination. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242679

FIELD BASED EXPERIENCE: A STUDY OF SOCIAL CONTROL AND STUDENT TEACHERS' RESPONSE TO INSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jesse Goodman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Jesse Goodman
Assistant Professor
Washburn University

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984.

SP024057

FIELD BASED EXPERIENCE: A STUDY OF SOCIAL CONTROL AND STUDENT TEACHERS' RESPONSE TO INSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS

During the last decade the amount of field based experience for preservice teachers has increased dramatically. Today, nearly all teacher education programs in this country contain at least some type of early field experience in addition to regular student teaching (Ishler and Kay, 1981). There seems to be an almost universal assumption among both educators[1] and students that field experience is the most crucial aspect of teacher preparation (Conant, 1963). In spite of this increased attention, little research explores what actually takes place during practicum experiences. Sarason et al. (1962) calls the preparation of teachers "...an unstudied problem." Fuller and Bown (1975) asks, "What's out there?" Reviews of the research literature in this field almost unanimously conclude that serious study of practicum experiences which illuminates what occurs during the process itself is desperately needed (e.g. Davies and Amershek, 1969; Popkewitz et al., 1979; Turner, 1975; Salzillo and Van Fleet, 1977). However, to date, only a few studies have investigated these experiences as they unfold over time. What do student teachers do in their practicum sites? What kind of environment do they encounter? What thoughts do students develop as they interact with their cooperating teachers, pupils, and curriculum?

Of particular concern to many educators is the process by which an individual "becomes" a teacher. Popkewitz (1979) and others suggest that before we can make substantive improvements within teacher education, we must begin to view this preparation as a process of socialization (e.g. Zeichner, 1980; Giroux, 1980). Recently, educators have focused this interest concerning the

socialization process into theories of reproduction and resistance in an effort to more accurately crystalize this dynamic event. Reproduction theory focuses on institutional forces that compel individuals into predetermined behavior patterns and perspectives, thus reproducing social, political, and economic norms (e.g. Apple, 1979; Giroux, 1981; Bowles and Gintis, 1977). Going beyond reproduction theory, many of these educators are now also examining the ways in which individuals resist the institutional forces that reflect this dominant culture (e.g. Apple, 1982; Giroux, 1983).

In an effort to address these concerns, this paper will be divided into three sections. First, after outlining the methodology, it will report the results of an ethnographic study that explored the field based experiences in a teacher preparation program that emphasized student involvement in practicum sites. This section will illustrate the institutional and social forces that shaped the behavior and ideas of these preservice teachers. Second, the paper will illuminate the various responses students had towards these influences. Third, the relationship between reproduction/resistance theories and the study's findings will be articulated in an effort to more accurately understand the basic strength and weakness of these theoretical frameworks.

Methodology

The methods used to collect and analyze data were those associated with ethnographic field studies (Glaser and Strauss, 1975; Bruyn, 1966). This research approach was used because it allows for the generation of theory which is grounded in recorded data, as well as the verification of existing theoretical notions found in professional literature. This grounded theory research is free to combine a variety of data gathering methods in developing interrelated hypotheses about teacher preparation and socialization.

Setting and Sample Selection

The sample was located in the Elementary Education Program (EEP) at State U., a large southeastern university (all proper names are fictitious). The EEP was often referred to as a "field based" program, implying the importance given to practice teaching in the students' professional development. Students were placed in a practicum site during their first quarter in the program and were required to spend at least five out of the six quarters necessary for graduation in some type of field placement under the supervision of a regular elementary school teacher. With each passing quarter, the students were expected to take on more responsibility for planning and implementing classroom activities. Students started as "Teacher Initiates," then became "Teacher Assistants," "Teacher Associates," and finally "Intensives," in which they ideally assumed responsibility for all subject areas and administrative tasks for a minimum of five weeks.

The program emphasized quantity and diversity in the students' field experience. Through exposure to a variety of classroom experiences, students were expected to develop a broad perspective of education. The program's literature encouraged experimentation and the integration of theory and practice in student teaching. As the Field Experience Guidebook stated, "It is to be noted that EEP students are desirous of tasks within the field which will allow them the opportunity to apply newly acquired curricular methods and theories." The quantity of field experience was ideally designed to give students the opportunity to explore the nature of teaching and learning, and to implement the findings of this exploration into their own practice.

Nearly all of the students enrolled in the EEP came from the southeastern part of the United States; however, they reflected a variety of social, economic,

and cultural backgrounds. Each student was at least a junior in college, most were between the ages of 20-25, and approximately ninety-five percent were women. An initial group of 23 students was randomly selected. After securing case histories, 12 students were chosen as the primary, although not exclusive, sample group. Care was taken to include students: at different levels of their professional education (Teacher Initiates--Intensives), from a diversity of backgrounds, who expressed varied interests, and of different ages and sex. These individuals were selected following guidelines of theoretical sampling--that is, on the assumption that differences among the participants would facilitate the discovery of theoretical questions, categories, and interrelationships (Glaser and Strauss, 1975).

Methods for Data Collection

Observations and interviews (both formal and informal) were the two main methods of data collection. In addition, the program's literature was reviewed, e.g. student and faculty handbooks, articles written by faculty members, university catalogue, weekly newsletter. Data were recorded in field notes during a six month period--two university quarters.

Each student in the sample group was observed in his/her practicum site at least once, lasting from two hours (e.g. Teacher Initiates) to the entire school day (Intensives). One to three follow-up observations were made of six students from this sample group. The students were observed teaching different subjects within a variety of settings (large group, small group, and individual instruction). The purpose of these observations was to discover what actually happened in the practicum sites. Rather than predetermining specific items to look for, a number of general questions were used to initially guide these observations: How is the classroom organized? What types of interpersonal dynamics exist between the pupils, students, and cooperating teachers?

What is taught in the curriculum? What information, opinions, and/or beliefs are exchanged between the participants? More specific observation questions were developed from reviewing field notes and were used as the basis for follow-up observations. In addition, students were observed as they participated in weekly seminar groups (Goodman, 1983) and university education courses (Goodman, 1983a).

Interviews were conducted before and after each practicum observation. In addition, students within the sample group were interviewed on a weekly or bi-weekly basis as they participated in the other components of the EEP (seminar meetings and education courses . At first, interviews did not have specific, predetermined questions. Instead, interviews were structured around various areas of concern such as: the purpose of practice teaching; perceptions of what happens during practicum experiences; individual responses to the organization of, people, and events found within the practicum sites. As field notes were analyzed, more specific questions emerged and were then asked during interviews to gain deeper insight into situations and to clarify misconceptions and ambiguities. Responses from the sample group were often cross checked with other students enrolled in the EEP. One in-depth interview was conducted with each cooperating teacher from the sample group and three cooperating principals. Interviews were designed to discover the way in which individuals interpreted the world around them, and the way these interpretations were used as the basis for their actions.

Analysis

Glaser and Strauss' (1975) "constant comparative" method of analysis was used as a guide for understanding the data. Throughout the fieldwork, interview and observation notes were reviewed daily. Incidents and bits of

information were at first coded into tentative conceptual categories. As these catagories emerged, questions arose that were used to guide further investigation into the field. The findings from these investigations were then compared to the initial categories. Special attention was given to data that seemed to challenge original conceptualizations. Through this constant comparison of data, analytical categories crystalized. For example, during the initial observation of students, it appeared that the elementary curriculum played a decisive role in determining their behavior. Later this observation was confirmed during interviews. More observations were made to check this hypothesis out, and to explore exactly how this curriculum effected the students' behavior. As these findings emerged from the data, they, too, were checked out during more comprehensive interviews. As a result, the "elementary curriculum" became an analytical category. In addition, the decision to explore reproduction/resistance theories was not made previous to the field work. The significance of these theoretical frameworks emerged only after the data were analyzed. This return to the data source, followed by modification and/or new generation of ideas, continued until the findings could be presented in some detail. Finally, the participants were given the opportunity to respond to the study's findings before a final draft of the study was written.

As suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1975), the analysis presented in this paper takes a narrative form, using examples from the data to clarify concepts and to demonstrate the interrelationship between analysis and social reality. From this perspective, analysis is not a static product. Instead, it is viewed as "...an ever-developing entity" (Glaser and Strauss, 1975, p. 32). One's analysis should be open to modification by the originator as well as other scholars. The data presented in this paper are not designed to "prove" the

infallibility of the analysis generated. Rather, the goal is to illuminate concepts and thus provide a basis for further discussion and debate. Presenting the analysis in narrative form reflects its "ever-developing" nature.

The Field Experience and the Forces of Social Control

Consistent with other research findings, the students within the EEP considered their field experiences as the fundamental substance of their entire education. Students often said that they "...learned to teach in the (elementary) classroom," and therefore spent most of their energy in this endeavor. As is common in most institutional settings, students entered a preexisting world when placed in a practicum site. This "world" had certain customs, rules, belief systems, and behavior patterns that were largely taken for granted as being normal. As Berger and Luckman (1967, p. 59) state, "Institutions, by the very fact of their existence, control human conduct by setting up predefined patterns of conduct which control it in one direction as against the many other directions that would theoretically be possible." As students entered the schools, they confronted both overt and covert forces that influenced their behavior and attitudes. As long as the daily routine continued without interruption, most students viewed these forces as unproblematic. In this way, these institutional forces socially controlled the students' experience of "becoming" a teacher.

The Elementary Curriculum

In the practicum sites used by the EEP, the elementary curriculum was the primary force of social control. The schools' curriculum was predetermined and highly routinized when the students arrived. One of the first questions students asked themselves upon entering their practicum sites was: "What

should I teach?" To a large degree, the answer to this question controlled what students (as well as pupils) did in the classroom. The standard curriculum determined the daily schedule, course content, and learning/teaching activities. Each subject had its alloted time, and in most practicum sites there was no attempt to integrate subject matter. Almost every lesson was taught using professionally developed curriculum materials (teacher's manuals, textbooks, workbooks, and standardized tests). In most cases, students were observed drilling and/or testing for pupil "competency" of prespecified, short term facts and/or skills. The emphasis was on having children read, recall, and repeat "correct answers" that were found in the textbooks.

Reading, math, and grammar dominated the curriculum. In the primary grades these were the only major subjects taught. In grades 4-6, these subjects still dominated, although social studies and science were each taught for half a year. Of all these areas, reading clearly prevailed over the rest. Many students mentioned that they had taught nothing but reading until their Intensive practicum started. Usually, the first teaching task assigned to students was to work with a child or small group with their reading. All of the public schools in which students were placed used the same "Skills Development" program to reading instruction. Reading was not portrayed as a wholistic activity that involved the child's imagination and his/her relationship to books, knowledge, or language. Instead, reading was defined as the summation of discrete phonics, comprehension, contextual, and/or structural analysis skills. Each skill was broken up into hundreds of sub-skills, stated in behavioral terms, and taught separately. Success was measured by quantitative tests.

Students were often observed implementing the various "steps" of this

particular reading program: First, pupils were "pre-tested" on a given skill. Second, they were drilled using workbooks. Third, they were given a "Criterion Test" at the end of each skill area. Fourth, if the pupils passed all of the "Criterion Tests," they took a "Mastery Test" at the end of the chapter. If the pupils failed part of either the "Criterion Test" or the "Mastery Test," they were given "Booster Activity" worksheets to drill them on the specific skill needing attention. This process continued until the pupils passed the "Mastery Test," and then they could begin the next chapter in the textbook.

Deviating from this mechanistic sequence was rare. Jeannie's teaching was representative of the students' experience.

> Jeannie called group A to the table (7 children) for reading. Each child read a few sentences from a story about some girls and boys who found a turtle and built a little house for it. After the story was finished, Jeannie asked a few comprehension questions, and then she explained the phonic skill being covered in the workbook for that day. After going over the directions, she told the children to return to their seats and complete the assigned pages. She then went around to individual children and helped them. ...After gym, she called group C to the table and gave them a "Criterion Test." She gave out the test, went over the directions, and watched to make sure the children weren't looking at each other's tests. (observation of Jeannie, Teacher Associate).

This routine was rigidly followed. A number of students and cooperating teachers said they had pupils who "know the skills" or who "can read," but because they had not passed the "Mastery Test," they could not move on to the next chapter in the textbook.

In other subjects, the approach to curriculum was similar. Both the content and procedure were predetermined according to the standard materials used in the practicum sites.

> Debbie complained, "They (professors) tell you to be creative, to bring stuff into the classroom, to try different ideas, but when you get out here all you do is follow the "Heath (math) Program." Judy responded, "Well, ideally you are supposed to start with the text, but then take off from there. But realistically, that just doesn't happen. There isn't time to do much more than just teach the skills." (interview with Debbie, Teacher Initiate, and Judy, Teacher Associate).

The relatively few times social studies or science were observed being taught, the emphasis was on using pre-packaged, commercially developed "programs."

Most students had little involvement in curriculum development or decision making. As part of their education courses and Associate/Intensive level practicum experiences, students were required to plan and teach a unit of study. Thirty-seven of these students were asked if they had ever taught a unit in which the topic(s) of content and learning activities were developed from their own research and decision making. Only three students responded affirmatively. To fulfill this requirement, most students either taught a series of lessons directly from a text or at the most made minor revisions/additions. When students were asked why they were teaching what they were teaching, the most common answers were: 1) the cooperating teacher told them what to teach, 2) the lesson was next in line in the textbook, and/or 3) the curriculum was required by the school board. Students had a deferential attitude towards curriculum "experts," people who wrote textbooks and specialists in the school system. For the most part, students did not question the rationale or educational principles that served as the basis for curriculum decisions. Questions of why and what to teach were taken for granted and seen as someone else's job. In this manner, the elementary curriculum greatly narrowed the range of teaching activities found in the practicum sites, and as a result, served as a powerful force for social control.

The Accountability and Testing Movement

Closely related to the elementary curriculum as a force of social control was the accountability and testing movement within education. Both the dominance of reading and a "skills" approach to curriculum in general directly reflected the emphasis of the state's "competency" test. The influence of this test had increased dramatically in recent years. In 1975 all pupils in

their junior year of high school took a state-wide "Functional Literacy Exam" to test their ability to read. This exam broke reading down into discrete sub-skills and tested pupils' "mastery" of them. Seventy percent of the pupils failed at least one part of this exam. There was a public outcry that the tax money for education was being wasted. Since then, schools have been under pressure to increase pupils' scores on this standardized test. In the community fifty miles north of Huntsville (where State U. is located), the superintendent and each principal were fired, and half the teachers were put on probation because the pupils' test scores were the second lowest in the state and well below the national average (observation of Laura's mid-point conference with her university supervisor). During a local T.V. program on education, the superintendent of Huntsville's schools consistently used the rise in pupils' test scores as the proof that the system had improved under his direction (observation of local T.V. program).

Each principal interviewed stated that the rationale for using a "Skill Development" approach to reading and math was that these programs were specifically designed to increase children's scores on standardized tests. Both cooperating teachers and students said that "teaching for the test" was the major determinant of curriculum decisions.

> There were a few "suggested activities" at the end of the chapter (in the basal reading text) that sounded kind of neat. I asked her (the cooperating teacher) if I could do some of these with the kids, but she told me not to "waste time." We had to keep drilling the kids on their skills because the (state) test was coming up soon, and she wanted the kids to do well on it (interview with Teri, Teacher Assistant).

There were strong implications that the pupils' test scores reflected the quality of teaching found in a given class. The emphasis on state test scores created an atmosphere of anxiety and subtle intimidation in most of the

classrooms observed. Cooperating teachers and students often made reference to this pressure. As the importance of drilling and testing increased in the students' minds, their inclinations to be creative or inventive were subtly but systematically dampened. Many students looked upon "doing things differently" with trepidation.

> I think we probably teach kids not to learn by making it so dull and purposeless. What's the alternative? Let's say I wanted to get away from all the drilling and testing, and focus on developing the kids' creativity and enjoyment of learning. ...But even if I knew how to teach this way, the question is whether I would even risk it. Let's say the kids get really turned on, but because you haven't drilled them on their skills they don't do well on the tests. Then what happens? You get screwed from not following the set curriculum. Whereas, if you do what you're supposed to, and the kids don't do well, you can always blame them for not wanting to learn (interview with Bob, Teacher Associate).

A number of students expressed vague doubts about what was happening in their classrooms. They knew "something" was wrong, but weren't able to articulate what it was. Without a sufficient knowledge base to propose and/or support alternative approaches to existing procedures, most students wouldn't take the risk necessary for experimentation.

The Nature of Instruction - Management

As students learned what to teach, they also focused attention on how to teach. Due to the heavy emphasis on pupil achievement, the purpose of schooling was to bring children to a certain academic level within a prespecified time period. Neither students or their cooperating teachers had any say in determining the skill level or time period that was set, nor did this schedule take into account any of the individual children within a particular classroom. To most students, getting the pupils "through the material" was the primary task of "instruction" and "learning" became synonymous with successful test scores.

> The discussion centered on the problem of motivating the pupils to read i.e. finish their assigned workbook pages. A number of suggestions were made. Robin then shared that in her reading group she let the kids tell personal stories, and at the end of the period she hadn't finished the assignment. She felt she had failed. The next time she was "a lot firmer" and didn't let the pupils wander from their reading. She finished the assigned story, the pupils finished their workbooks, and she felt much better. After each person spoke, the seminar leader concluded their comments by saying "good," "super," "great," or "wonderful" (observation and summary of university seminar meeting).

The major concern for most students was on an outcome or product, not the process of education. For example, integrating children's comments into the teaching of reading could be very effective in encouraging pupil learning. However, because this activity might hamper "getting through the material," it was not considered a viable option.

The effect of this educational goal was dramatic. Instead of "instruction" being an activity in which teachers (students) and pupils explore and share knowledge, stimulate interest, and work together towards a commonly arrived at intellectual goal, "teaching" became an activity or problem of management.

> When I look back at my field experiences, the thing that strikes me most is just how little actual teaching went on. (She was asked for clarification.) You know, where you sit down with the kids and <u>teach</u> them something (content). Mostly, you just organize the day--make sure everyone was doing what they were supposed to, passed out worksheets, and graded tests (observation of Susie's, Intensive, final conference with her university supervisor).

Students were often reminded that "being organized" was crucial. Students learned to: organize and manage the day's activities around the curriculum, separate the pupils into their respective ability groups, parcel out the appropriate time for each subject and group, plan so that while they were working with one group the other children were kept busy with "seatwork," schedule in specials (gym, music, etc.) to keep their disruptive effects down to a minimum, as well as take care of the daily roll, order materials from the office, supervise the transportation of pupils from one place to another,

and finally, keep track of everyone's "progress" (schoolwork).

The most common management concern expressed by students was discipline. Students spent much of their time thinking about "management" techniques to help them get their pupils through the lessons without any disturbance.

> My teacher is always yelling at the kids to "be quiet." If it was up to me I'd try to do more creative things like hold a paper clip up in the air and tell the kids that I want to be able to hear it hit the floor (interview with Debbie, Teacher Initiate).

In an effort to keep the children quiet, orderly, and on task students were observed turning lights on and off, putting names on the board, counting down from ten, sending pupils to "time out" corners, being "positive" (pointing out those pupils who are quiet and on task), and keeping children in from recess. Finding discipline techniques that "work" were often the topic of seminar discussions (Goodman, 1983). No issue seemed more important to students than management and control.

There were numerous institutional forces that supported this managerial conception of instruction. First, the "skill development" programs used in the practicum sites were designed for little teacher input. The curriculum came complete with specific learning objectives, procedures, time schedules, and tests--all organized for the teacher's implementation. Cooperating teachers and cooperating principals, as agents of the school, supported this approach to instruction. When first arriving at a practicum site, the principal often emphasized the themes of management and organization in his/her introductory remarks to the students. Principals were directly involved in making sure curriculum schedules were followed.

> The big push this year is "curriculum monitoring." I spend a lot of my time checking to see if my teachers are covering the competencies required by the district (interview with Ms. T., Cooperating Principal).

Each of the principals interviewed required their teachers to turn in weekly progress reports that disclosed what pages in the textbooks the class had studied.

Most cooperating teachers did not see themselves as "teacher educators." They often expressed feeling "swamped" in their own paper work and viewed students as individuals who could help them in their efforts to manage their class more effectively. "Having a student can be a big help. While I'm working with one group, she can be working with another" (interview with Ms. R., Cooperating Teacher). Student/cooperating teacher conferences tended to be polite but superficial, focusing on technical and procedural concerns; not substantive issues of education. Mary's comments describe most of the conferences observed.

> Most of the time is spent dividing up the day's chores: deciding what groups to take, who will gather what materials (workbooks, texts, etc.), splitting up the paperwork, taking attendance ...stuff like that (interview with Mary, Intensive).

When cooperating teachers were asked to name the most important lessons that students needed to learn, their answers almost unanimously focused on operational problems and management techniques. Students were positively reinforced if they followed the standard curriculum and managed the class in a smooth, quiet fashion. There was little support for alternative methods and/or curriculum.

Although a few faculty members within the EEP questioned this conception of instruction and the curriculum design that supported it, most took it for granted. Seminar meetings, for example, usually focused on immediate, utilitarian concerns of students in their practicum sites. Most discussions were dominated by students sharing management techniques related to a specific problem (Goodman, 1983). Methods courses emphasized a "behavioral objectives"

approach to lesson plans that paralleled the curriculum plans used in the "skills development" programs found in the practicum sites. Although students were often told to "be creative," in most classes this idea meant students should supplement the standard curriculum and instructional procedure by making games, bulletin boards etc. and not to question or alter its basic format (Goodman, 1983a).

In summary, the elementary curriculum and the accountability/testing movement that supported it had a strong influence on the nature of instruction found in the practicum sites. Students had little control over either what or how content would be taught. Only a few students used techniques to encourage pupil problem solving, self-directed learning and research, and thoughtful interpretation and expression of content. The vast majority were observed doing routine, mechanical types of teaching activities involving little creativity. However, due to the quantity of field experience, each Intensive student interviewed said that by the end of their final practicum, they were "ready to teach." What most students meant was that they had become technically proficient: they had learned how to manage and organize the given curriculum and classroom schedule, and they had learned enough discipline techniques to feel secure in facing a classroom of twenty to thirty children.

Student Reactions

While the elementary curriculum, accountability/testing movement, and other institutional agents that promoted a managerial form of instruction provided a systematic and socially controlled experience, it would be misleading to assume that all students were shaped into a uniform mold. Although there were general tendencies to think and behave in certain ways, a closer examination revealed that students acted upon this reality in four distinctive styles.

Passive Acceptance

This reaction was characterized by a general, uncritical desire to "fit into" the existing institutional order. These students spent most of their energy discovering what was expected of them and fulfilling those expectations. Learning how to manage the curriculum, class schedule, and discipline problems gave them confidence that they were doing things "right." If a child scored 65% on one test and 75% on another after "instruction," these students felt secure in knowing that the child had actually "learned something." Developing learning activities and/or a philosophy(ies) of education independent of what the schools demanded did not seem very relevant to teaching in their eyes. Discussions in seminar meetings or methods courses that did not have a direct application in practicum sites were experienced with indifference and/or impatience (Goodman, 1983, 1983a). There was a general resignation regarding the social reality found in the field placements. These students enjoyed the feelings of acceptance they received from cooperating teachers and principals as they learned "...the nuts and bolts of running a classroom" (interview with Sharon, Teacher Associate).

Active Acceptance

Although some students accepted the status quo without much thought, others actively embraced the attitudes and practices found in the practicum sites. These students consciously believed in the schools' definitions and purposes of teaching and learning. To these students the existing curriculum and nature of instruction seemed natural. If one wanted to learn something, it would be "just common sense" to: break the knowledge up into discrete parts, drill individuals until they mastered these parts, and then test them to make sure they knew it. This approach to education appealed to their cultural logic with its concern for pragmatism, sequential thought process,

technical definitions of human endeavors, specialization, efficiency, and order.

The value of drilling and testing was tied to their concerns for children.

> I think it's a good thing. After all, these kids (first graders) are going to be tested all their lives. If they don't learn how to do it now, it will only be harder for them later in life (interview with Wendy, Teacher Associate).

Teaching children to obey rules, routines, and time schedules was considered an important part of teaching them to become "responsible" citizens. Standardizing the curriculum was perceived as a good way to insure "equality in education." If the curriculum was the same for everyone, charges of discrimination could not be raised. At the same time, worksheets were seen as an effective means to "individualize instruction."

> They (worksheets) really help you know where everyone is at (academically). Individuals who are having trouble in one (skill) area or another can get special attention by giving them the proper "Booster Activity" (interview with Mary, Intensive).

Finally, the "Skills Development" approach to reading gave these students a sense professionalism, which came from learning a specialized vocabulary. Words such as: diphthongs, derivational endings, phonograms, etc. all became part of the students' language that remained outside the layman's comprehension. The knowledge associated with this approach to reading gave these students the feeling that not "just anyone" could teach.

Latent Resistance

Latent resistance was another reaction some students had towards their practicum experiences. On the surface it appeared as if these students accepted the status quo; however, internally they maintained a desire to do things differently when eventually employed. These individuals were vocal about their concerns to change things, and often spoke of not becoming "traditional." They had many characteristics found in some young adults:

the need to give to others, to fight social ills, to question our institutions, and to change and grow as people and professionals.

> Right now I'm trying to figure out what's important to teach. Not just the academics, but teaching children about life, and how to live it fully. ...If I got in a school that imposed the "back to basics" on me, I would just have to use my creativity to come up with ways of sneaking other subjects in (interview with Vicki, Teacher Initiate).

Many students engaged in "wishful thinking," in their practicum sites. When not busy, they would day dream about how they would do things "...if this was my class." They seemed to be searching for some kind of workable compromise between their fantasies about developing good rapport and helping children, and the real demands of classroom life. Much of the search focused on the conflict between believing they must follow a set curriculum and time schedule, and their feelings that to be "really educative" they should depart from the everyday routine. For the most part, this turmoil was dealt with silently. Most students felt uncomfortable asserting their ideas within practicum sites. While they may have disagreed with what was happening in their field experiences, they did not want to alienate their cooperating teacher and risk receiving a bad evaluation.

Overt Resistance

While most resistance remained covert, a few students did openly alter their practicum experience. This opposition usually took the form of students negotiating "space" for themselves within the established structure of the classroom. Students who wanted to be given the chance to experiment found out the names of cooperating teachers (through the student grapevine or from their seminar leaders) who were "flexible" and gave students "freedom." It is important to remember that even when students were given "freedom" to alter the situation in their practicum sites, they usually stayed

well within the basic structure of the curriculum and nature of instruction. To most students, "...doing what I want," referred to the interpersonal style they developed with children, and not basic educational changes.

> (Jeannie was in the same class for both her Teacher Associate and Intensive experiences. During the former experience, she expressed a strong dislike for the "boring routine" in the classroom, and was now asked if the two experiences were different.) "Yes, now I can do what I want." (She was asked to describe the day, and it sounded exactly the same as when she had been observed last quarter. This response was shared with her.) "Well, what I meant was that now I have my own way of doing things, my own style of teaching. Like in discipline, she (the cooperating teacher) used the 'time out corner' as a punishment. I've tried to use it as a place where kids can go to "cool down," not necessarily because they are "bad." ...Generally, I think I'm more relaxed with the kids (interview with Jeannie, Intensive).

Although narrow in scope, a few students did try to change the social reality found in their placements.

In addition, there were two students who attempted to create more substantive alternatives within their field placements. These students did not want to merely follow the standard curriculum or nature of instruction. While they were in their placements, they negotiated time to teach their children units that they developed themselves.

> I think the most interesting thing I did was plan a unit on ecology. I ended up doing a lot of my own research on the topic. Along with teaching children the science of how everything is interconnected, I also wanted to teach them about the conflict between business interests and naturalists... Instead of having the kids read only a textbook and fill out worksheets, I had them make an art display illustrating the balance between all things, they saw a movie about the habitats of wild animals and how they are being destroyed, I brought in a guest speaker from a local environmental group and from the local utility company, and I had the kids read newspaper articles and children's books that dealt with endangered species and man's relationship to the earth. I ended the unit by having the students write poems and letters to the government about this topic. It was neat deciding what to teach and how to teach it (interview with Judy, Teacher Associate).

Neither Judy or Kate were content with the role of manager of predetermined curriculum. In interviews they expressed the importance of teachers developing

curriculum based upon their own and/or their pupils' interests. Each one also made it a point to implement their beliefs during their practicum experiences. To some degree, they also believed it was important to question the social/ political norms found within this country. They felt that this questioning was important to insure the development of a democratic society. As part of her case history, Kate mentioned being influenced by the civil rights and anti-war movements of the sixties and seventies. She expressed a desire to, "in some small way," help change society through her teaching. As a result of these beliefs, she chose topics of study that would increase her pupils' social/ political awareness.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of student reactions was that although each student had a dominant response to their field experiences, each accepted and resisted, to various degrees, the pre-existing "world" they entered as student teachers. It seemed they were sorting out in their minds (consciously or unconsciously) how to respond to the constraints they found in their field placements. At times they allowed the constraints to define their experience and found comfort and security in having the school determine those limits for them. At other times they became frustrated by them and wanted to knock the constraints down in the name of "true education" or "justice." Being disappointed in the gap between what they originally thought they would be able to do as teachers and the lack of autonomy they saw in the real world of schools, a few students expressed discouragement. The third response was to find some "freedom" within the constraints, and hope that as "teachers" they would be able to act instead of simply cope with the situation. Perhaps these reactions reflected an underlying internal dialectic. On the one hand, there was a voice that spoke to the students' needs for security and acceptance into

the existing profession of their choice. Like many young adults, these students were insecure of their future place in society. The tight job market in education added to these fears. As a result, "fitting in" became an important career goal. On the other hand, there was a voice that spoke to the students' needs to create and alter the world they were about to enter. As children they were always being told what to do; now they wanted to try out some of their own ideas. Except for in a few cases, it seemed as if the first voice was louder in most students than the second. However, this internal dialogue clearly continued up to and possibly beyond graduation.

Theories of Reproduction and Resistance

One of the goals of social science is to develop theories that help us understand social reality. As Glaser and Strauss (1975) emphasize, theory should be grounded, as much as possible, in human experience. One of the values of ethnographic study is that close examination of a singular setting can yield insights into the subtleties of social reality often missed in more generalized, quantitative research. In this way, our theoretical notions of the social world can become more refined. As previously mentioned, the findings of this study are presented in an effort to illuminate theoretical concepts of professional socialization, and thus provide a basis for further discussion.

Reproduction Theory

Reproduction theory has given us insight into the socialization process by focusing our attention on the way by which schools mirror (and hence reproduce) the institutional life found within the dominant society. As a result, reproduction theorists suggest that schools play an important function in the perpetuation of a technocratic, utilitarian, and object-orientated

social ideology. They argue that this ideology has little concern for human inquiry, social justice, or democratic control (e.g. Apple, 1979; Giroux, 1981; Whitty and Young, 1977). From this perspective, schools shape and mold pupils into largely predetermined social categories, and through institutional control inhibit their ability to analyze and, therefore, alter their life situation (e.g. Willis, 1980; Bowles & Gintis, 1977).

In applying these ideas to teachers, most individuals have borrowed from industrial studies such as Braverman's (1974) analysis of the emerging labor process. Braverman (1974) concludes that as a result of the increased emphasis on specialization and efficiency, workers are gradually becoming "deskilled." They are losing control over their craft and becoming increasing dependent upon experts and production demands that are made without their input. The results of this emerging labor process include: the fragmentation of work into discrete activities, restrictions on the range of possible work related activities, systematic repetition of those activities, and separation of work from the social and ethical responsibility underlying production. Making a leap from work in an industrial setting to teaching/learning in schools is not difficult given the findings of this study. From this perspective, test scores are the product, pupils are the workers, and teachers are managers or shop foremen/women.[2] Just as the workers and managers are becoming more controlled through systematic application of scientific management, the range of teaching and learning activities found in the EEP's practicum sites were greatly restricted by the "scientific" curriculum making reflected in the standardized classroom programs. Just as workers and middle level managers are often pushed to produce more products with little increase of capital expenditure, pupils, students, and cooperating teachers felt pressure to increase test scores as efficiently as possible without a reduction in

pupil/teacher ratio. Finally, just as managers are often judged by how "smooth" they run their shop, students were primarily judged on how well they got their pupils through the given lesson in a "smooth, quiet fashion." As part of their socialization into teaching, these students were systematically becoming "deskilled" (Apple, 1982). Rather than learning to be craftspeople who develop curriculum based upon their own and/or their pupils' interests and who creatively use materials, personal skills, and innovative resources in planning and implementing learning activities, these students were, for the most part, being trained as educational technicians.

While the findings of this particular study clearly illustrate the validity of reproduction theory in education, these same findings also illuminate its basic weakness. As a number of individuals both in their study of industry (e.g. Burawoy, 1979) and schools (e.g. Apple, 1982; Bullough et al., 1983; Giroux, 1983) have been quick to point out, reproduction theory has overemphasized the notion of external domination over the individuals within a given social context.

> Reproduction theorists have... failed to provide any major insights into how teachers, students, and other human agents come together within specific historical and social contexts in order to both make and reproduce the conditions of their existence (Giroux, 1983).

Although a few students were perhaps passively molded or shaped by the external forces of the elementary curriculum, accountability and testing movement, and managerial demands; most students took an active role in determining their experience. Students were constantly making choices in their efforts to meet institutional objectives, outside pressures, and internal expectations. Even students who "passively accepted" the external forces mentioned above, were involved in decision making. Most students at some time during their two years in the EEP either "actively accepted" and/or "latently

resisted" these external forces, making their participation more noticeable. While external forces provided a powerful influence, students were definitely involved in creating the existential situations and experiences which determined their emerging professional role. By ignoring this involvement, and the contradictions and struggles that exist within schools, human creation evaporates and reproduction theory is left with only social structures. As a result, the very essence of social reality is removed from observation and analysis. In the process, the seeds for productive change are also implicitly crushed. While this insight is not particularly new, its reiteration and illustration are necessary if we are to move away from the overly deterministic, structural-functionalist theories of human life that have dominated social science for most of this century.

Resistance Theory

Resistance theory emphasizes the notion of human involvement in the study of schools and their relationship to the dominant society. This theory rejects the implied hopelessness embedded in reproduction theory and focuses on the way in which individuals or groups of individuals struggle against social domination. Ideally, resistance theory would give relatively powerless teachers and pupils insights for potentially changing schools (and eventually society) into more humane and intellectually stimulating environments.

The notion of resistance is relatively new in educational research and theory which perhaps explains its present lack of development. While resistance theory more accurately reflects the complex dynamics that exist within institutions and society, the findings of this study illuminate certain ambiguities that need to be addressed.

First, perhaps as an overreaction to the emphasis placed on external control over individuals found within most traditional research, resistance theorists and researchers have tended to focus on any oppositional behavior as examples of resistance. From this perspective, any worker action against the control of "scientific management" (Burawoy, 1979) or teachers' reactions against the control embedded in pre-packaged curriculum programs becomes a basis for resistance (Apple, 1983). As Giroux (1983) points out, this perspective of resistance emphasizes behavior and ignores the crucial aspect of human intentions. Oppositional behavior alone cannot insure genuine resistance. One cannot assume that a rejection of standardized curriculum materials will result in better education. For example, there were a few students within the EEP who "resisted" the scientific curriculum programs found in their placements by not following all of the directions. However, these individuals did so not because they had a better alternative, but because they didn't really care about education and, therefore, did as little as possible. In addition, there were some students who "actively accepted" the education found in their practicum sites and as a result "resisted" those curriculum programs that weren't directive enough.

> I'm supposed to use this science program that's supposed to develop inquiry skills, but it's too loose. I mean it doesn't really show you what you're supposed to teach the kids. So I asked my teacher, and she said it would be okay to just use the old textbook instead (interview with Tom, Intensive).

One cannot assume that increased teacher control will automatically result in improved education. Finally, resistance needs to be seen in light of the actual or potential change that occurs within a given setting. Even if we can assume that one's oppositional behavior and intentions are positive, to what degree does change have to occur before it reflects genuine

resistance? Most of the resistance exemplified by the students in this study actually changed very little of the basic curriculum and procedures found in the practicum sites. One might question whether "latent resistance" offers any potential for substantive change. For example, as previously illustrated (see p. 12), a number of students, like Bob, wanted to alter the education found in their practicum sites, but were fearful to do anything concrete. Unfortunately, this dynamic had restrictive implications for the future.

> What scares me the most is that I'll end up getting coopted. Now I'm saying that I can't do what I want because I'm in someone else's classroom. Then I won't be able to do what I want my first year or two of teaching because I won't have job security. I'm just afraid that by then, I won't remember what it is I wanted to do in the first place (interview with Bob, Teacher-Associate).

While it is impossible to tell what will happen in the future, resistance theory needs to look at more than just what individuals might do i.e. their intentions. We must be careful not to romanticize resistance as potential for change, and thereby ignore the very real constraints that may influence future teachers.

Recognizing the relationship between behavior and intention is an important step in further developing resistance theory; however, it is equally important to clarify our notions of "positive" intentions and actions. A number of educators have used the concept of emancipation as a useful criteria by which to judge oppositional behavior. Does one's resistance lead to his/her own self reflection; and the social, intellectual, and ethical liberation of others within society? While this idea may at first seem like an easily understood notion; unfortunately, most discourse in this area has been shrouded in a level of theoretical complexity that one must question its usefulness to produce research that will eventually help emancipate those very teachers and pupils we so quickly champion. In our attempt to be

scholarly, there is danger in creating a language system that is effectively inaccessible not only to most teachers and pupils, but also to colleagues who may share similar perspectives. Our inability to distribute these theoretically complex ideas may not only result in a form of intellectual elitism, but may also lead to greater misunderstanding and confusion.

Nevertheless, the concept of emancipation is extremely useful in establishing a criteria for resistance. Based on the findings of this study, the notion of emancipation, as it relates to pre and/or in-service teachers, can be understood by examining three areas of concern. That is, resistant teachers struggle towards three emancipatory goals. First, like Judy and Kate, resistant teachers reject the narrowly defined role of teaching as the management of predetermined curriculum programs. As craftspeople, they were intellectually alive and seriously questioned what's worth teaching/learning. Perhaps at the heart of this craft is teachers' desire and ability to develop their own curriculum based upon progressive principles of curriculum design (e.g. Goodman, 1983b; van Manen, 1982; Short, 1983). The art of developing curriculum involves: choosing worthwhile topics of study; developing the themes, concepts, or areas of content that make up this topic; researching these themes to increase the teacher's own level of knowledge concerning this topic; discovering resources that children can use to explore these themes; developing activities that illuminate the themes of the topic and promote curiosity, creativity, and/or thoughtfulness among pupils; and organizing these themes, resources, and activities into a coherent unit of study. Developing curriculum is similar to writing a documentary or an article on a given topic. It requires interest in the subject matter, motivation and skill to research relevant information, energy to discover new sources, and

the ability to organize the findings of this work into a form that other people can understand and enjoy.

The second concern expressed by resistant teachers is for human rights. As Nash and Ducharme (1976) suggest, this concern is manifested in two ways. Teachers who are also human rights activitists make an effort to develop classroom environments that promote freedom within necessary limits. Dewey (1938, pp. 51-65) makes the point that these teachers are leaders from within the classroom community rather than outside of it. There is concern for promoting attitudes of social equality, respect, and justice within the classroom. These teachers are often skilled in human relations. They are direct and honest in their interactions with pupils, able and willing to be effective listeners, and are adept at helping pupils express themselves. In addition to creating a humane educational atmosphere, a concern for human rights extends beyond the classroom. Resistant teachers are aware of when our public and/or private institutions fail to meet basic human needs. They are willing to take public positions against human misery and oppression, screen materials for possible racism, sexism, etc., and develop units of study that will increase pupils' social/political awareness and encourage their participation within and responsibility for society as a whole.

The final concern regarding emancipation centers around the notion of the "politics of teaching" (Kohl, 1976). Although the findings of this study suggest that there were several students who had potential for becoming resistant, at the time of the field work only a few individuals reflected the conception described in this paper. As Stake and Easley (1978) point out, more than good intentions and a strong knowledge base about alternatives are needed to change school practices. Constraints to innovative teaching cannot

be wished away. The forces of external control are strong. Isolated individuals cannot be expected to substantially alter present circumstances. In response, resistant teachers learn how to develop a base of support among other school personnel, progressive administrators, and the community. For example, as previously mentioned, students who wished to alter their practicum experiences sought out those cooperating teachers who shared their perspective or allowed students to experiment. When initiating alternative study units, they enlisted the support of their cooperating teacher, principal, and parents. Resistant teachers see themselves as part of a group rather than an individual effort to improve the quality of life within schools and society.

To summarize, reproduction and resistance theories have greatly increased our understanding of the socialization that goes on within both public and professional schools. The process of "becoming a teacher" is a complex experience involving psychological, social, and educational factors that are often subtle in nature. The development of these theories can help us gain insights into the way this socialization of teachers relates to our society as a whole.

Conclusion

Space does not allow a full discussion of the implications of these theories and the study's findings for teacher preparation. However, two conclusions are worth emphasizing. First, the dominant view of "good teaching" needs to be radically altered. Traditionally, good teaching has been viewed as the mastery of specific techniques of practice. Students learn to plan lessons, lead small groups, grade tests, and literally hundreds of other methods in their preparation courses. Unfortunately, this focus has been extremely narrow. We must begin to view teacher preparation as a process of professional socialization. Teaching cannot be isolated from the type of

curriculum used in the schools, who controls this curriculum, or how social pressures influence a classroom's atmosphere and teacher. Only when we help future teachers understand this socializing experience will we be educating students rather than merely training them.

The second conclusion concerns certain myths that surround field based experiences. As Zeichner (1980a) points out, the first myth is the notion that field experiences are universally positive. Just having students "out in the field" automatically results in the improvement of the students' teaching. As other educators have recently noted, the findings of this study suggest that these field experiences do little more than assimilate novices into traditional patterns of teaching (e.g. Friedenberg, 1973; Tabachnick et al., 1980; Iannaccone and Button, 1964). Overall, the field experiences within the EEP had a conservative effect on the students' perspectives and actions. It tended to inhibit students' creativity, intellectual involvement in curriculum, and range of teaching practices. Most field experiences restricted those individuals who wished to alter the standard practices found in their practicum sites, and comforted those who merely wished to conform. For the most part, these experiences were in clear contrast to the EEP's stated purposes of experimentation and the integration of theory and practice.

This first myth, gives rise to the second: field experiences are totally coercive. The student is viewed as a piece of clay that is molded into a conservative form by the agents and constraints of the school system. While this description is perhaps accurate in some cases, the findings of this study challenge its all pervasive quality. Many students came into the program with conservative perspectives of education. The field experiences merely reinforced that which was already there; its power to shape or mold individuals

was secondary to earlier influences. In addition, the notion that these experiences are totally coercive is challenged by evidence of resistance. The findings suggest that many students have potential to resist external pressures, and we need to explore ways of supporting these students in their efforts.

Although there have been numerous studies of field based experiences within teacher education, confusion over what actually happens during them still exists. Zeichner (1980a) notes that, "Field based experiences seem to entail a complicated set of both positive and negative consequences that are often subtle in nature." Most studies have failed to illuminate these subtleties. It is not surprising, therefore, that assertions such as, the more field experience the better, are in actuality untested assumptions. If our insight into this process is to increase, we need to know what actually happens in these programs over time. Is the field experience found in the EEP similar to other programs? Do students face the same forces of social control? Do they respond in similar ways? Official descriptions of and goals for field experiences cannot be taken for granted. Research that explores the way in which programmatic purposes are implemented can help us question our goals and develop better strategies for meeting them. If we are to be as concerned about the quality of these experiences as we are the quantity of them, more research is needed.

Notes

[1]To enhance the reading of this paper, the following word guide is provided: Educator - one who teaches or supervises students at the college level, Student - one who is enrolled in a college level teacher education program, Pupil - a child enrolled in an elementary or middle school.

[2]Bullough et al. (1983) make an important contribution in this regard. Traditionally, this literature has equated teachers to workers. However, as they point out, teachers more closely represent middle level managers since they clearly have both direct subordinates and superiors.

References

Apple, M. Education and power. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Apple, M. Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. Schooling in capitalist america. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Braverman, H. Labor and monopoly capital. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Bruyn, S. The human perspective in sociology: The methodology of participant observation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bullough, R., Gitlin, A., and Goldstein, S. Reproduction, role, and teacher resistance. A paper presented at the annual conference on Curriculum Theory and Practice, Dayton, OH, 1983.

Burawoy, M. Toward a Marxist theory of the labor process: Braverman and beyond. Politics and Society, 8, 2979, 247-312.

Conant, J. The education of american teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Davies, D. and Amershek, K. Student teaching. In R. Ebel (Ed.) The encyclopedia of educational research. 1969, 1376-87.

Dewey, J. Experience and education. New York: Collier, 1938.

Friedenberg, E. Critique of current practice. In D. McCarty (Ed.) New perspectives on teacher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Fuller, F. and Bown, O. On becoming a teacher. In D. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, 25-52.

Giroux, H. Ideology, culture and the process of schooling. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Giroux, H. Teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 162, 1980, 5-27.

Giroux, H. Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 1983, 257-293.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine, 1975.

Goodman, J. A reconceptualist alternative to technocratic curriculum design: A curriculum case study. A paper presented at the annual conference on Curriculum Theory and Practice, Dayton, OH, 1983b.

Goodman, J. An analysis of the relationship between university coursework and field-based experience: A question of relevance. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, Montreal, 1983a.

Goodman, J. An analysis of the seminar's role in the education of student-teachers: A case study. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 1983, 44-49.

Iannaccone, L. and Button, W. Functions of student teaching: Attitude formation and initiation in elementary student teaching. U.S.O.E. Cooperating Research Project No. 1026, 1964.

Ishler, P. and Kay, R. A survey of institutional practice. In C. Webb, N. Gehrke, P. Ishler, and A. Mendoza (Eds.) Exploratory field experiences in teacher education. 1981, 15-22.

Kohl, H. On teaching. New York: 1976.

Nash, R. and Ducharme, E. A futures perspective on preparing educators for the human service society: How to restore a sense of social purpose to teacher education. Teacher's College Record, 77, 1976, 441-471.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B. R., and Zeichner, K. Dulling the senses: Research in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 1979, 52-60.

Popkewitz, T. Teacher education as socialization: Ideology or social mission. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, San Francisco, 1979.

Salzillo, F. and Van Fleet, A. Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 1977, 27-31.

Sarason, S., Davidson, D., and Blatt, B. The preparation of teacher: An unstudied problem in education. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Short, E. The forms and use of alternative curriculum development strategies: Policy implications. Curriculum Inquiry, 13, 1983, 43-64.

Stake, R. and Easley, J. Case studies in science education. Urbana, IL: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, 1978.

Tabachnick, B., Popkewitz, T., and Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 10, 1980.

Turner, R. An overview of research in teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.) Teacher education: The 74th yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

van Manen, M. Phenomenological pedagogy. Curriculum Inquiry, 12, 1982, 283-299.

Whittly, G. and Young, M. (Eds.) Society, state, and schooling. Sussex, Eng.: Falmer Press, 1977.

Zeichner, K. Key processes in the socialization of student teachers; Limitations and consequences of oversocialized conceptions of teacher socialization. A paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, Boston, 1980.

Zeichner, K. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 1980a, 45-55.